

HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY

GOVERNING BOARD

BRIAN WILSON, PRESIDENT
JIM CHAPMAN, VICE PRESIDENT
NICK MCBRIDE, BOARD MEMBER
DAVID MESERVE, BOARD MEMBER
TOM HAMMOND, BOARD MEMBER

STAFF

JARED G. HANCOCK, EXECUTIVE OFFICER
HEIDI WHITLOCK, PROJECT MANAGER
NANCY CARDENAS, TREASURER

**HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING**

City Council Chambers
66 North Lassen Street, Susanville, CA 96130

June 2, 2015 - 3:00 p.m.

Addressing the Board

- Any person desiring to address the Board shall first secure permission of the presiding officer.
- Matters under the jurisdiction of the Board, and not on the Agenda, may be addressed by the public at a time provided in the Agenda under Public Comment
- The Board of Directors will not take action on any subject that is not on the Agenda

1 CALL TO ORDER

2 ROLL CALL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

3 AGENDA APPROVAL

4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of minutes from the May 6, 2015 meeting.

5 CORRESPONDENCE: None.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT

(any person may address the Board at this time to comment on any subject not on the agenda. However, the Board may not take action other than to direct staff to agendize the matter at a future meeting.)

7 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

- A. Discuss Audit Options
- B. Proposed Plaque Design

8 BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:

9 PUBLIC COMMENT ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS (if any): Any person may address the Board at this time upon any discussion item under consideration during Closed Session.

10 CLOSED SESSION: None.

- ***The next meeting will be held on June 16, 2015 at 3:00 p.m.***

I, Heidi Whitlock, certify that I caused to be posted notice of the regular meeting scheduled for June 2, 2015, in the areas designated on May 29, 2015.



Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

Krystle Hollandsworth

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: June 2, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Minutes of the HLVRA May 6, 2015 meeting.

SUMMARY: Attached for the Board's review are the minutes of the HLVRA May 6, 2015 meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

**ACTION
REQUESTED:** None.

ATTACHMENTS: Minutes: May 6, 2015 meeting

**HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Regular Meeting Minutes
May 6, 2015 – 3:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers 66 North Lassen Street Susanville CA 96130**

Meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. by President Wilson.

Roll Call of Board of Directors present: Dave Meserve, Jim Chapman, Brian Wilson, Nick McBride and Tom Hammond.

Staff Present: Jared Hancock, Executive Officer, Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager, Nancy Cardenas, Treasurer.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Motion by Board member Hammond, second by Board member Meserve to approve the agenda as posted; motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Board member Meserve, second Board member Hammond to approve minutes from April 21, 2015. Motion carried unanimously. Abstention: McBride.

5 CORRESPONDANCE: None.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

7 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

7A Discuss and Adopt Revised Proposed Budget

Mr. Hancock opened that on April 21st, we presented the Board with a proposed budget. At that time, the only requested changes were to the title and to separate out the revenues for construction from other revenues.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Meserve to adopt the budget for 15/16. Motion carried unanimously.

7B Discuss Design Comments Received

Mr. Hancock stated that requests were made at the last meeting to visit the site. Staff requested that members submit comments about the design and site. Visits occurred both before and after the agenda went out and comments were given. Mr. Hancock asked if members would like to share their own comments or if he should present them and stated that the preliminary design required more changes prior to going out to RFP.

Board member McBride stated that his comments are in the attachment and that is what he would like to see. The designs previously provided by the Aquatic Design Group 2A and 2B were the favorites. He continued that the Board asked for a professional opinion on which option would be best. He was not in favor of a partially paved parking lot due to City ordinances, the handicapped spaces were to be moved and the roof of the building and natatorium should be connected if a natatorium is built.

Board member Meserve stated that he and Mr. Hancock walked the site and he still liked the corner "L" shaped building.

President Wilson stated that he doesn't understand what exactly we wanted to accomplish with this. Mr. Hancock stated that this came out of the last meeting. The Board discussed bringing the pool closer to the building, lessening deck

space and having easier access to bathrooms. We need to know what other conditional items we need to discuss prior to hiring a contractor. If we still want to break ground this year, we need to get this going. We want to move forward in a direction that the Board approves of.

Vice President Chapman stated that he was rather disappointed that the Board didn't want to meet at the site. He viewed the site with Mr. Hancock and was impressed that the lot looked much bigger than he originally thought once everything had been removed. But, he wanted to see how everything on the map in front of them actually fit on the site. He again stated that if it is an outdoor pool, the view should be taken into consideration. He continued that the Board was looking at a quick build as it was one of the criteria in the site analysis and he doesn't want this to take 5-6 years. He stated his preference for the pool being more centered in the design and being able to use the building as a wind shield but he understands wanting to utilize the existing asphalt. We have a limited amount of time, 30-45 days. Next year is an election year and it will be a timing issue on both the political and financial sides. We need to go out to bid July or August and be breaking ground by September. If this goes into November, we may lose it. I will vote for whatever will get this project completed. We already lost time while looking at the Credence site and I don't want to wait to see if we receive the grant funding.

7C Discuss Preparation of a Design-build for Proposal

Board member Hammond asked what the next steps would be. Mr. Hancock responded that the best option with this timeline would be to break up the project into two areas, the design-build for the pool itself and suggested taking a sample design-build RFP and have it reviewed by the attorney then release it to get a contractor on board based on the design the Board already approved. The other component would be the bathhouses, parking etc... and would be a separate proposal. With the timeframe, it may not be feasible to do them together.

Vice President Chapman requested the cost difference or estimate between the "L" shaped building and the rectangular building. Mr. Hancock responded approximately \$350 a square foot plus 25%. President Wilson responded that he was sure it was closer to \$400 a square foot plus 25%. Vice president Chapman asked if Mr. Hancock thought it was a \$700,000 building or a \$1.2 million dollar building. He then stated that if there is a \$100,000 difference between the two buildings, we need to determine if we want it. We have stated we wanted bare bones and basic.

Mr. Hancock responded that it is a factor of square footage. We can make an "L" shape with small square footage. It was to accommodate the minimum so the square footage is fairly basic. President Wilson added that the "L" shape was a compromise that Mr. Hancock came up with because of Board member McBride and Vice President Chapman. Board member McBride responded that not everyone was happy with the "L" shape and it was requested that a professional opinion be given. President Wilson added that three members of the Board approved it so as not to hold up the project. Vice President Chapman stated that maybe the rectangular building would be the best option. President Wilson confirmed that Vice President Chapman was now okay with Board member McBride's idea on the drawing.

Discussion regarding the next step occurred. President Wilson stated he was not a designer and that a professional should be hired. Vice President Chapman asked if the action today should be to get someone to do this for us. President Wilson asked if we go to RFP, do we need specifics. Mr. Hancock responded, yes, we can include that they need to provide a schematic showing an "L" shaped pool, covered mechanical room and bathhouse, parking lot etc... Board member McBride stated that we will then not be using what we paid ADG for. Vice President Chapman asked if we can get this turned into a construction document in 45 days. Mr. Hancock responded, no. Vice President Chapman asked if we needed engineered plans and how we turn what we have into engineered plans. Mr. Hancock responded that this is why we discussed this at the last meeting. Does the Board wish to hire an engineer to get the plans only or are we going to go for a design-build. Vice President Chapman asked if the design build was the recommendation. Mr. Hancock responded, yes. Timing for this option was discussed and a four week timeline was given. When inquiries occurred it was stated that staff time to draft the RFP then getting the attorneys to review, it would not get back prior to the next meeting and staff would like the Board to okay the document prior to it going out. President Wilson states that a special meeting be scheduled to go over it once completed and back from the attorneys. The Board agrees.

President Wilson requested further explanation on the splitting of the projects. Mr. Hancock responded that we want to be able to be competitive with pool builders since most do not do parking lots, buildings etc.... so it's been their

suggestion to separate them out. The pool project will move a few weeks ahead of the other components so information can be shared for the other areas. President Wilson asked who would be responsible for making sure everyone stayed on task. Mr. Hancock responded that he would be responsible. Board member McBride asked why we don't simply have a pool contractor do that portion. Mr. Hancock responded that we had the discussion last meeting. Board member Hammond asked Richard Egan, Lassen County CAO, what his opinion was on the topic. Mr. Egan responded that, timing wise, the design-build would be the best option.

President Wilson asked if this is based on someone already possessing a set of building specs and a cost savings. Mr. Hancock responded, yes, but also time. The more overlap the more contingency and more reason to split it out. Board Hammond responded that he is not sure that he likes the idea of splitting it out.

President Wilson stated that staff should start working on an RFP as soon as possible. However, design it closer to Board member McBride's suggestion of using 2B from ADG, with a rectangular building, not "L" shaped. But, if the "L" shape is feasible then yes. President Wilson stated, just no going over budget.

Mr. Hancock asked for clarification and stated the basic idea for the RFP would include a parking lot to the east, a pool on the west and a building in between. President Wilson states yes, and we can alter if we receive the grant. Partial motion was given but further discussion stopped the motion.

Tony Jonas asked if we do get the grant, would that still work as we would not be building what they designed. Mr. Hancock responded that we can have it designed but not build it until the grant is awarded. However, it would not be his suggestion as the plans would just be sitting on a shelf. Board member McBride stated that the building must be built so it can be added onto at a later date.

President Wilson stated that he is hearing two different things. The design must have the ability to add on later and have drawings but, it will cost more to add on later. He added that they will have to take some amount of risk. It is asked how much cost savings there could be if the Board chooses to split the project. Mr. Hancock responded it could be hundreds of thousands of dollars. Mr. Egan suggested creating an RFP where firms can choose to bid on one or both of the projects so a true cost savings can be seen. The Board approved of this idea. The Board also discussed using ADG's 2B design with the changes proposed by Board member McBride in regard to the parking lot area. Discussion occurred on what the exact wording of the motion.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Hammond to have staff prepare an RFP for a design-build contract which will include an "L" shape pool on the west side of the parcel, a parking lot on the east side of the parcel and a building between the two with 1) a not to exceed amount 2) an option to amend the design if grant funding is awarded and 3) a general provision that it will be designed with the consideration for a future natatorium to be added.

8 BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:

Vice President Chapman stated that, as the design evolves, there should be site visits so they can have more interaction with the public so they can be involved.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: June 2, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Discuss Audit Options

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority needs to perform their 13/14 and 14/15 fiscal year audits. In October 2014, the Board decided to go with a two year auditing option due to the minimal activity in the 13/14 fiscal year. The HLVRA has already been utilizing County staff to fill the Treasurer position and to adopt the County's purchasing policy. Given these circumstances, staff has contacted Price Paige & Company and, because of the amount of transaction activity in the 14/15 fiscal year, Price Paige and Company has agreed to perform a 2 year audit for \$5,750.00.

FISCAL IMPACT: \$5,750.00 included in budget

**ACTION
REQUESTED:** Information Only

ATTACHMENTS: None.

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: June 2, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Proposed Donor Plaque Design

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority has discussed presenting a plaque to each agency who donated land for the purpose of the new community swimming pool to show the Board's appreciation of this action. Attached is the proposed plaque design.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

**ACTION
REQUESTED:** Direction to staff.

ATTACHMENTS: Proposed Design Option.

SUSANVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority appreciates
your commitment and generous contribution of property
for a community swimming pool

